DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 280 SO 010 736

AUTHOR Eddy, Junius
TITLE Arts Education 1977: In Prose and Print. An Overview of Nine Significant Publications Affecting the Arts in American Education.
SPONS AGENCY Federal Interagency Committee on Education, Washington, D.C. Subcommittee on Education in the Arts and the Humanities.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 90p.; Financial information on pages 23-25, 74, 77 has been removed by ERIC

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aesthetic Education; *Art Education; Art Expression; Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; *Creative Art; Curriculum; Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Essays; *Fine Arts; Government Role; Humanistic Education; *Humanities; Literature Reviews; Program Planning; Relevance (Education); School Community Relationship; *State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

The booklet summarizes nine recent publications representative of the growing number of reports about arts education in the United States. Selected for reasons of significance and usefulness for policy formation, the publications include descriptions of exemplary programs, summaries of research, and handbooks for effective school-community cooperation. The documents are: "Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education," by the Arts, Education and Americans Panel; "The Education of Adolescents," by the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education; "Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support of Arts Education," by the Alliance for Arts Education; "Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education;" "Arts in Education Partners: Schools and Their Communities;" "Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future;" "Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter;" "Try a New Face (A Report on the 'Arts and HEW' Project)," by the Music Educators National Conference; and "The Arts Endowment and Education," by the National Endowment for the Arts. A comparative summary of the nine documents points out the need for greater federal support of arts education, careful program planning, and involvement of professional artists at pre-collegiate levels of education. (AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151280

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ARTS EDUCATION 1977 -- IN PROSE AND PRINT

An Overview of Nine Significant Publications Affecting The Arts in American Education

Prepared for

The Subcommittee on Education in the Arts and the Humanities

of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education

by Junius Eddy

September 1977

SO 010 736

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

The Publications Surveyed

Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education, a report of the Arts, Education and Americans Panel, 1977. 7

The Education of Adolescents, the final report and recommendations of the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education, 1976. 15

"Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support of Arts Education," a Position Paper of the Alliance for Arts Education, by Junius Eddy, 1977 21

Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education, 1977. 31

Arts in Education Partners: Schools and Their Communities, Nancy Shuker, editor, 1977 39

Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future, Stanley S. Madeja, editor; 1977. 47

Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter, by Judith Murphy and Lonna Jones; forthcoming. 57

Try a New Face, (A Report on the "ARTS AND HEW" Project), Music Educators National Conference, Charles Gary, editor; forthcoming 65

"The Arts Endowment and Education," an in-house Position Paper of the National Endowment for the Arts, A.B. Spellman, editor; 1977 73

Comparative Summary and Conclusions 79

Bibliography

List of Publications Surveyed and Ordering Information 89

Other Recent Reports Dealing with Arts Education 91

Introduction

During the period 1976-78 there will have appeared, in print and manuscript form, an extraordinary array of documents bearing on aspects of the arts in American education -- a field which, only a decade or so ago, was little more than a glimmer in the professional educator's eye.

These documents, moreover, are only the tip of an enormous mountain of published and unpublished materials which have been produced in this and recent years by all manner of institutions, agencies, and programs concerned with education in and through the arts. They include the reports of various panels, commissions, and conferences; case studies of exemplary programs; guidelines for curriculum development; research studies and monographs; program and project reports; Federal and state agency position papers; journal articles -- and, of course, the anthologies, collections of essays, and doctoral dissertations by authorities in the field which have been produced as books and marketed by commercial publishing houses.

Nine of these more recent publications are under consideration in this survey. Four are reports and position papers resulting from deliberations by national panels or commissions; two are the outcomes of national conferences; and three report on, or otherwise deal with, arts education programs (past and present) supported by two Federal agencies: the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Endowment for the Arts.

Taken together, such a vast outpouring of prose and print devoted to this long-neglected dimension of American education would seem to suggest -- if it does nothing else (and indeed it does) -- that this is a field which, at long last, has begun to come of age. In ten short years, from a position at once moribund, fragmented, and isolated from the traditional concerns of schooling and the education professionals generally, the arts education field has begun to coalesce. It has begun to form productive alliances with arts resources in the community, to think systematically about program planning and implementation, and to make its voice heard at the highest levels of educational policy and decision-making. In no uncertain terms, and with increasing sophistication, in a word, it has begun to "get its act together."

This is not to suggest that all -- or even most -- of its battles for a legitimate and recognized place in the educational sun have, indeed, been won. In fact, as most of the publications surveyed in this report attest, the engagement has only just begun.

The vast majority of public school systems in the nation still treat "the arts" as a kind of educational stepchild. Thousands upon thousands of youngsters still graduate from high school without having been touched in any significant way by programs in the arts; the few students who have are frequently those with particular interests, gifts, and talents of an artistic nature. Classroom teachers who, in schools without access to specialists, are responsible for what little arts learning children may receive, possess few of the skills necessary for

quality instruction in these disciplines. Arts specialists themselves are being eliminated from school faculties under the double-barreled pressures of rising costs and decreasing school populations. Support for needed research in the arts and aesthetic education is hardly discernible. And the interest among institutions of higher education for redesigning the education and retraining processes of both generalist and specialist teachers in the arts is visible in only a handful of "lighthouse" colleges and universities. (And, one is compelled to add, Washington's educational decision-makers and policy planners seem generally not to notice -- to put it nicely.)

The litany could be added to endlessly. And yet, in the face of all these disheartening and frustrating signs, there is beginning to be significant evidence that countervailing forces are gathering. An Arts Education Movement is, indeed, emerging within American education; and it is preparing itself -- and its noneducational, community-based partners -- to make tactical and strategic inroads in the vast educational enterprise which deals with the young in our society.

Most importantly, having begun to get its act together, the growing sophistication of professionals in this field -- as noted above -- has enabled it to produce the kind of carefully reasoned and targeted documents which can influence comprehensive planning and policy development at all operational levels.

The documents and publications included in the present survey lend themselves to these purposes. They have been selected somewhat at random

from among others which might have been included because they appeared to be especially useful in addressing such planning, development, and policy concerns. Furthermore, appearing within the short span of a year and a half, they are the most recent and significant of the major publications in the field. Many of them will, in fact, be reaching broad national audiences. They will be discussed by the arts and education constituencies in numerous local and regional conferences during 1977-78, and the outcomes can therefore be influential ultimately in policy development because they span a wide range of grassroots interests and concerns within the arts education field.

The question might well be asked, however -- if all this heady prose is now sitting on people's bedside tables waiting to be read, why another exercise in verbiage to add to the pile? Well, as a group of written documents they bulk rather large, and both policy-makers and conference-goers are busy people -- they often don't get around to reading all their background materials, whatever their significance. For policy-makers in particular, the time problem is acute; if they had to read and digest all these materials in toto in order to make informed judgments for program development or policy formulation, most of these documents would probably still be sitting on bedside tables, unread, when crucial decisions were made.

Thus, it seemed appropriate to try to digest them (briefly and succinctly, of course) and provide a general overview of their substance and content. These summations, it is hoped, will enable FICE Subcommittee

members -- and other interested parties, including prospective conference-goers -- to have a general sense of thrust and content without getting bogged down in a welter of elaboration and detail. It is also possible, of course, that these brief summaries -- like the notices of new books -- may whet the appetites of interested readers and persuade them to obtain copies of the genuine article and delve deeper.

The phrase "notices of new books" brings up another point. These summaries should not be considered "reviews," in the sense that critical judgments have been applied. For the most part, they are nonjudgmental descriptions of the content of these publications. Occasionally, to be sure, this observer's opinions may have crept in, to some degree, and in one or two instances, clearly, he has been somewhat lavish in his approving adjectives. His intention was, however, to indicate that all of these documents are valuable contributions to the field and to make it as clear as possible what each of them deals with.

In a final section, however, there does appear a brief analysis of what this reader/observer feels are the more common concerns emerging from these documents and some indication of issues that may have been given slightly short shrift or neglected entirely.

Junius Eddy

Junius Eddy is an independent consultant in the fields of education and the arts who now lives in Rhode Island. He was, from 1966-69, an arts education specialist with the Arts and Humanities Program at the U.S. Office of Education. More recently he has served as a Program Advisor to the Division of Humanities and the Arts at the Ford Foundation, and a Consultant on Arts Education to the Rockefeller Foundation's Arts Program.

Coming to Our Senses:

The Significance of the Arts for American Education

The arts education field has for some time now been lacking the kind of comprehensive and persuasive national statement that would articulate its unique "power and urgency" to the American public -- and to those of her citizens who are in educational and political decision-making positions. This handsome, eminently readable and copiously illustrated book, published by McGraw-Hill in May of this year, may well be what the burgeoning arts education "movement" has been waiting for.

Coming to Our Senses does indeed live up to the promise of its subtitle, for its pages delineate with much passion and some pragmatism what it is of significance that the visual and performing arts can contribute to the education of American youngsters. (That word "can" is, of course, significant too, because this report of a distinguished panel of businessman, scientists, artists, and educators makes it clear that "learning in, through and about the arts" is very far indeed from achieving those educational purposes at the present time.) But the report could, if widely read and reasonably considered by decision-makers and ordinary citizens alike, serve as a kind of rallying call to the nation to counter the historic neglect of the arts in American schools and bring what John Goodlad has called "the upsidedown curriculum" back in balance at long last.

The two-year research effort of the Arts, Education and Americans Panel which resulted in the 330-page report was supported by a consortium

of private foundations as well as by the U.S. Office of Education and the National Endowment for the Arts. Chaired by David Rockefeller, Jr., with Norris Houghton (dean emeritus of theatre at the State University of New York at Purchase) as co-chairman, the panel's membership included author James Michener, former education commissioner Francis Keppel, WNET president John Jay Iselin, publisher Barry Bingham, Sr., Nobel Prize-winning physicist Glenn Seaborg, former CBS president Frank Stanton, dancer Melissa Hayden, pianist Lorin Hollander -- and sixteen other prominent Americans. Margaret Howard, a former State Department cultural exchange officer, served as project director, ably assisted by a staff of researchers and editors.

The study was conceived by the American Council for the Arts in Education when Professor Joseph Sloane (now director of the Ackland Art Museum at the University of North Carolina) was its president in the early 1970's. It was brought to active life through the tireless efforts of Norris Houghton, who succeeded Sloane as ACAE president. The ACAE itself served as what Mr. Rockefeller calls the panel's "corporate parent" throughout the two-year life of the study.

No specific authorship is attributed to the report, but it is apparent that one of its early chapters ("Roots and Branches of Learning and the Arts: A Review of Traditions") has had the benefit of some particularly scholarly investigation -- and one suspects that chapter may be the work of Dean Houghton himself. It painstakingly traces the varied influences that have tended to separate the arts from formal

learning in America, from colonial times to the present. And it sums up these developments by saying:

> . . . as we trace today the cultural history of America, we are forced to pursue two parallel lines: one of education, strong and straight; the other of the arts, wavering and uncertain . . . not until the last thirty of the three hundred years do we see sure signs of the two lines converging, of a conscious effort to move the study, practice and appreciation of the arts from the periphery of the educational experience toward its center.

The remainder of Coming to Our Senses is devoted to placing "the evidence that such signs are now apparent" before us. It does so in a kind of "K-through-adulthood" approach, beginning with the arts as "a better primer for our children," moving on to "the creative energy of the adolescent," to the place of the arts in higher education and on to a consideration of the arts in community life -- all within some kind of educational context, formal or otherwise.

There is a major chapter concerned with the "powers behind the curriculum" -- those teachers, artists, and administrators who will, in large measure, determine whether and how rapidly the arts will one day be adopted "as a basic component of the curriculum deserving parity with all other elements. . . [and ultimately therefore] become central to the individual's learning experience, in or out of school and at every stage of life."

Another chapter scrutinizes the rich educational potential of community arts resources and suggests that the growing instances of "cooperation between schools and non-school institutions may be a promising route for increasing the funds that are available for arts

education, as well as providing new ways of learning" beyond the schools. (See Arts in Education Partners, discussed later in these pages, for a detailed treatment of this development.)

Still another looks at "The Promise and the Problems of the Media" as one of the specific and more immediate ways in which elements of the arts are already reaching into the classroom. And it touches on some of the ways in which imaginative video artists and teachers are making valuable use of this new learning tool -- with an emphasis, happily, on what students can learn by manipulating the technology themselves rather than simply watching ETV programs beamed into the classroom.

Throughout all these sections, the panel's report illustrates its arguments with descriptions of exemplary and innovative arts programs in nearly 100 schools and communities around the nation. Many -- like those in which the JDR 3rd Fund has been involved -- will be familiar to longtime workers in the field, but there are accounts of scores of other projects not so well known, where sound and effective work is going on that offers hope for the field as a whole and valuable insights for those school systems now planning to get into it.

The entire narrative of Coming to Our Senses, moreover, is bulwarked with statements made to the panel by members of the project staff -- who presented the results of their research -- and by hundreds of other arts education practitioners and observers who were interviewed or gave testimony during the course of the panel's five three-day meetings held variously in New York, Memphis, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis.

In one of its final chapters, entitled "Analyzing the Present, Mapping the Future," the report surveys the problems and prospects facing this growing constituency as it moves toward more concerted action in the cause of arts education. This section also contains a report by the panel's staff, which selected three representative states -- Michigan, North Carolina, and Washington -- for intensive examination. These case studies, as the report says, "reflect fairly diverse interests, problems and pressures. . . [and] give us an opportunity to observe major activities and a typical cast of officials in the policymaking process: The governor, the state legislature, the department of public instruction, and the states' arts councils and commissions."

Although this important document seeks -- and deserves -- a wide parent and citizen response to its challenge, it is clearly to those decision-makers in the fifty states, as well as to the Congress and the Federal establishment, that Coming to Our Senses is largely addressed. And they, in particular, will be the key as to whether or not any or all of the panel's 98 separate recommendations (in 15 major categories) receive serious consideration and ultimate action.

The 15 categories under which the recommendations are grouped range broadly across the field -- from "making art," "beyond 'music and art'," and "how children grow," through considerations for teachers, artists, and future artists, to issues relating to new leadership development, the community arts, higher education, the new technology, and the ill, isolated,

and handicapped among our citizens. And they encompass, in a final grouping called "Next Steps," those crucial matters of policy, funding, and research which are the focus of most of the other publications being surveyed here.

To mention only a few of the specific recommendations, the panel proposes that the U.S. Office of Education be constituted as a cabinet-level department and that a special advisor for arts and education be appointed to serve the new Secretary of Education. It calls for the creation of a National Center for Arts in Education which would be a Federal agency responsible for coordinating information about artists, programs, funding, and research. And it urges the existing Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities to carry out, in consultation with the states, a ten-year strategy for the arts in education. State governors are also urged to establish cabinet-level positions for the arts, and each municipality is urged to form an arts commission concerned with education.

Beyond these broad policy issues, the panel recommends that state and local arts councils begin to coordinate more purposefully the various community arts resources that can serve educational needs; that regional information clearinghouses be established; and that local arts institutions assume a greater responsibility for arts education.

Further, with respect to schools themselves, the panel calls on school districts to allow students to earn academic credit for work and study undertaken in community arts programs of recognized educational value; that schools make opportunities for creative work available for all

students, not only the talented or highly gifted student; that the curriculum be expanded beyond art and music to include dance, film, drama, and design; and that academic programs and in-service training for teachers, arts specialists, and administrators be revised to provide broad experience in a variety of arts disciplines and in the ways in which they can be related to one another or contribute to other disciplines.

It is a broad spectrum of needs that is being addressed here and it is perhaps unlikely that all -- or even many -- of them will be acted upon or accomplished in the immediate future. Few readers of this document, in fact, are likely to agree with everything in it or be able to support all its recommendations. And there are (surprisingly, in such a broad-brush approach) some oversights among the recommendations -- the failure, for example, to spotlight the need for expanded certification measures for theatre, dance, and media arts specialists, and the failure to include the colleges and universities specifically in the section on development of "future artists".

It may be, moreover, that Coming to Our Senses contains little that is really new or startling for those already committed to, or involved in, this field of arts education. But it does make the case for "the power and urgency of arts education" more clearly and forcefully than it has ever been made before to those Americans who are uncertain or confused about this issue and who therefore remain unconvinced. For the first time, it brings together in one document a range of arts education con-

cerns which must be addressed if change is to occur, and it identifies some of the crucial policy and funding issues required to get the job done.

It is essential, therefore, that the report be widely read and debated by professionals in education and the arts, and by concerned citizens in all walks of life who move increasingly into advocacy roles to advance the arts-in-education cause.

To this end, it should be noted, David Rockefeller, Jr., Norris Houghton, and Margaret Howard have announced that -- although the AEA Panel has now disbanded -- they are staying in business for the next few years to serve the cause as catalysts and advocates. They have formed (and are the principal officers of) The Arts, Education and Americans, Inc., a nonprofit corporation which will serve as a clearinghouse for their work, and they are now seeking additional funds to carry that work forward. Looking ahead to the prospect of a major White House Conference on the Arts in Education in the fall of 1978, they are working in concert with other organizations (the professional arts education associations, the American Council for the Arts, and the Alliance for Arts Education, principally) to set up a series of regional conferences during 1977-78. These conferences would provide a public forum where the panel's recommendations and other related issues can be widely considered and discussed. Out of all this year-long grassroots activity, a clear and composite "agenda" for such a White House Conference may well emerge.

The Education of Adolescents

This document, published by the U.S. Government Printing Office in 1976, is the "final report and recommendations of the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education." It is the result of an almost-four-year investigation of secondary education in America by a blue-ribbon panel of noted educators, chaired by Dr. John Henry Martin, one of the country's most respected school administrators. The panel was appointed in 1972 by the then-U.S. Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland, Jr.; over the four years of its study, it heard testimony from a score or more authorities on varied aspects of high school education and adolescent development, and it commissioned as many background papers on the subject.

Its inclusion here, therefore, may seem somewhat out of place -- since only one of the background papers and six of the witnesses could be said to be authorities in the arts or in arts education. All but a few of the report's 142 pages, furthermore, don't really have much to do with arts as such -- excepting perhaps in the report's general "humanistic" overtone and possibly a section concerned with "Aiding the Adolescent in Coping with the Mass Media."

Why, indeed, include it then in this survey of recent publications on aspects of the arts in American education?

One part of the answer is simply that the panel's first and central recommendation is aimed at creating new educational environments for learning, and this dramatically opens the door to -- and "legitimizes,"

if you will -- a kind of education in the arts which more and more school systems already are beginning to explore.

The panel's first major recommendation is "that the unattained practice and inadequate concept of the comprehensive high school be replaced with the more practical goal of providing comprehensive education through a variety of means including the schools." It elaborates on this argument by saying that "what is needed is greater diversity in formal education which reflects the actual diversity of the learning situations and the variety of experience that living in today's world demands." It goes on to point out the forces which have

> . . . tended to keep understanding of education narrowed to that which could take place only in a school. The powerful dynamic to learning which comes from direct experience has accordingly been vitiated in an overemphasis on the classroom as the sole place for learning. The Panel sees no incompatibility between moving appropriate segments of education into a closer relationship to the community while maintaining the political immunity of the schools. There will be risks, but the need to bring greater realism and social engagement to the education of adolescents warrants the move.

This is something, of course, that forward-looking arts education leaders have known -- and begun to put into practice in such programs as the Minneapolis schools' Urban Arts Program -- for some time now. (Wallace Kennedy, who administers the Urban Arts Program, was the only arts project director invited to speak to the panel at its hearings, incidentally.)

But what is rather startling is to find this prestigious non-arts-oriented panel making the connection directly in its second major

recommendation -- which seems worth quoting in full:

> That educational programs be inaugurated for the joint participation of adolescents and other interested and qualified adults in the community--pedagogical programs which may be designated Participatory Education (learning by doing what is socially useful, personally satisfying, and health-supporting for the individual and the community).
>
> The Panel sees three major areas of education that lend themselves to such combined participation -- education in the arts, vocational education, and education in the operations of government. (emphasis added)
>
> For educating in the arts the Panel recommends creation of a community arts center closely associated with the high school.

The panel goes on to suggest that such a center would be governed and sponsored by "a community council for the arts (and) would provide facilities and support for all the arts and crafts for which sustaining interest was forthcoming." It sees amateurs, professionals, volunteers, and paid personnel competing for program space for instruction in day and night programs in all of the creative and performing arts. And it suggests that by "enrolling adolescents and other more mature adults, including grandparents, the reintegration of the generations should bring new vitality to learning, to the arts, and to community cohesion in activities where age is the most irrelevant criterion for participation."

To be sure, such a precise "blueprint" as this may seem, to some practitioners, to set the concept a bit too firmly "in concrete." There are already a number of variations on the idea of a more comprehensive school-community arts program (the Cultural Education Collaborative in Boston, Chicago's Metro High School, and the Cultural Voucher Program of

Museums Collaborative, Inc., in New York City, to name only three). And other communities are beginning to investigate other possibilities inherent in the idea of "the city -- or community -- as educator," often with the arts leading the way.

But imaginative teachers, administrators, community leaders, and professional artists will certainly not be restrained -- by such a blueprint -- from creating further variations on the theme, when and how they can. The importance of the recommendation, indeed, does not rest on its specificity, but on the fact that it was made at all, and given such prominence by this prestigious body of educators (none of whom, it bears repeating, are either artists or arts educators).

On the other hand, they have obviously listened closely to what the arts educators who spoke to them had to say -- Vivienne Anderson, Harold Arberg, John Kerr, Floyd Johnson, and Wallace Kennedy. But they listened particularly to Maxine Greene, Professor of Philosphy and Education at Columbia University's Teacher College.

Maxine Greene contributed a background paper for the panel's consideration entitled, "The Arts in the American High School: A Proposal." It is a seminal piece of work, at once philosophic and highly pragmatic, and most of the ideas about the arts which ultimately found their way into the final panel recommendations were drawn from her paper. We know this because the panel clearly thought so highly of it that "a major part" of Chapter 8 of the report, "Providing Aesthetic Experiences for Adolescents," is identified as having been excerpted from her background paper.

Some direct quotations may suggest the general flavor and tone of that Greene-derived chapter:

> The Panel's proposal here is that the several arts be given a central place in the high school curriculum and that they be conceived in an integral relationship with the traditional subjects.
>
> The primary concern will be the possibility of reconceiving the high school curriculum so as to make the arts a significant part of each young person's everyday reality.
>
> Members of the Panel do not believe the arts represent a panacea for everything that ails the high school -- or, for that matter, the troubled adolescent of our time -- nor do they believe that arts have the capacity to bring about a moral revolution or even, necessarily, to improve the quality of most peoples' lives. The Panel is convinced, however, that the fundamental reorientation required by a consideration of the arts as focal can open up new perspectives on the function of the high school today. Possibilities for new kinds of fulfillment may be revealed. New patterns of integration may be discerned, as well as new vantage points on the quest for meanings.
>
> The Panel's argument . . . begins with an emphasis on the importance of enabling individuals to recover themselves as persons. . . . It follows that the process of educating young people for participation in and encounters with the arts must be a process of liberating them to find and be themselves.
>
> . . . the old dichotomy between performance and appreciation [may be] irrelevant where the high schools are concerned. The problem is to involve young people with the arts in such a way [that] they <u>do</u> become "sources of personal understanding and enjoyment," while at the same time providing opportunities for the enrichment of perception and the making of authentic personal statements.
>
> The implication is for an integration of creative opportunities into the humanistic curriculum.
>
> The problem of the high school is to make participatory experiences possible -- for the sake of heightened aesthetic perception, not so much for their own sake.

And finally:

> An arts program, in other words, can radiate in manifold directions, if arrangements are made for a continual interplay between actual confrontations in the studio and cognitive study in a contextual domain outside.

The entire chapter is a valuable contribution to the field, if only in terms of rationale, although it is certainly much more than that. One hopes that it will be obtained and widely read in the context of the full report by educators and practitioners of the arts and education alike.

Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support of Arts Education

It is surely no secret that government agencies at state and national levels have grave difficulty communicating regularly with one another. Often, in turn, this bureaucratic insularity makes coordinated planning on policy matters that involve joint concerns well nigh impossible. The inevitable result is a breakdown in the delivery of services for major legislative programs whose constituencies overlap to some degree or have a broad spectrum of unmet developmental needs.

In the Federal agencies especially -- due in part to their size and complexity, and to their remoteness from the ultimate targets of their intended services -- this problem has become increasingly acute in recent years, with the almost exponential growth of the nation's population.

Among the many developmental needs which have lain relatively fallow as a result of this situation are those which lie at the intersection of the fields of education and the arts. The unmet needs are many, and they are multiplying as the admittedly disparate arts education movement has begun to come of age over the last decade.

It was both to assist this diverse arts education constituency in "getting its act together" and to address the Federal policy coordination issue that an ad hoc coalition of arts education leaders came together in July of 1976 at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C.

The group, calling itself the National Arts Education Advisory Panel (NAEAP), was formed to provide informal assistance to the staff of the Alliance for Arts Education (AAE), which is the educational arm of the Kennedy Center and itself a joint project of the Center and HEW's Office of Education. The NAEAP met regularly over the past year under the auspices of the Alliance, whose Executive Director, Forbes Rogers, chaired the meetings. The outcomes of the group's deliberations were drawn together in written form by Junius Eddy and now appear as an AAE position paper entitled "Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support of Arts Education."

The NAEAP was composed of "a score of professionals who, by virtue of their administrative leadership positions, have differing responsibilities with respect to arts education in the nation but who share common concerns about its present status, its continuing needs, and its future development." Significantly, its membership included representatives of all the Federal agencies which administer visible legislative programs in this field -- HEW, through its Office of Education and its National Institute of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Kennedy Center's Alliance for Arts Education.

The stated purpose of the NAEAP was "to assist the AAE in fashioning a definitive statement with respect to arts education which would set forth fundamental purposes, priority needs, and proposed new legislative programs around which its respective constituencies could

unite in a common cause."

While the resulting position paper may not fully address the latter objective, it does bring together statements about "the major continuing needs" in this field which could be met or ameliorated by new legislation growing out of more coordinated Federal policies. It places these needs firmly on the table for consideration by all relevant agencies. Further, it proposes them as a minimum "agenda" for deliberation by several committees that already exist within the Federal establishment for coordinating arts and humanities concerns in their educational contexts: namely, the Subcommittee on Education in the Arts and Humanities of FICE (the Federal Interagency Committee on Education), and the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, which advises both Endowments on common problems.

In its early chapters, the position paper describes and analyzes the relevant programs and legislation which already exist -- that is, "the several Federal programs which have come into being over the last decade that address, directly or indirectly, some of the emerging national needs in arts education." There are eight separate programs in all, only three of which -- operating on HEW funds -- have a legislative mandate to assist arts education specifically:

The Alliance for Arts Education (the joint program of the Kennedy Center and the Office of Education) with 1977 funding of

The Arts Education Program (administered by the Office of Education through arrangements with the JFK Center) -- also $

The National Committee/Arts for the Handicapped (a new program with to allocate in FY 1977).

Two other programs have had their primary purposes defined largely by agency policy (rather than by legislation) for support of arts education:

The Education Program of the National Endowment for the Arts (mainly though not exclusively its Artists-in-Schools Program, which had an estimated funding of million in FY 1977.)

The Special Arts Projects of OE's Emergency School Aid Program (funded at million for 1977.)

The final three programs fall into a category which, by virtue of legislative mandate, makes arts education eligible for support as one of the number of areas toward which funding can be directed:

The Educational Research and Development Program of the National Institute of Education (which currently supports Harvard's Project Zero and two educational laboratories -- CEMREL and SWRL -- engaged in arts education curriculum development); $ million in 197[illegible] out of a total NIE budget of $ million.

The Division of Education Programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities (which directs perhaps $ annually to aspects of curriculum development, teacher education, and other projects in which the arts are used as vehicles for humanities education).

OE's Educational Innovation and Support Program, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IVc (supporting supplementary

educational centers and services in activities which may include the arts); 1977 funding of music and arts projects by the states was approximately $ million, up from $1.5 million in FY 76.

It should be noted that other USOE programs provide funds for state and locally administered programs (mainly ESEA's Title I and the Emergency School Aid Act) which are currently being used to support local school-based projects in the arts.

The AAE position paper points out that the two programs which administered the lion's share (at $ million) of the current funding in this field -- NEA's Education Program and OE's Special Arts Projects, both of which direct their support essentially to artists working in the schools -- "are limited in their ability to address a variety of other crucial issues which affect the kind of quality of teaching and learning in this field." On the other hand, those programs with a clear legislative mandate to support arts education are operating in 1977 under allocations which together amount to about $ million.

In view of this profound disparity in funding levels, the position paper's specific recommendations concern themselves primarily with strengthening the position of those arts education programs in the latter category, by urging Congressional action for considerably higher authorization and appropriation levels. At the same time, however, it calls for an increase in the funds made available to the Arts Endowment's Education Program to enable an expansion of its Artists-in-Schools and Learning Through the Arts Programs. And it makes a specific plea for

increased budgets for research and development in the arts at the National Institute of Education and other agencies (such as the National Endowment for the Humanities) having educational research and development, curriculum development, and dissemination responsibilities.

These actions, the paper points out, would build "on what already exists in terms of current Federal programs . . . to sustain the burgeoning arts education efforts at a minimum level of support . . . (and) expand this effort modestly during the period when deliberations leading to more comprehensive and coordinated policies are being developed."

The "major continuing needs," whose delineation takes up the middle sections of the AAE paper, are divided into two large categories -- those relating to professional and staff development needs and those concerned with research and development needs.

The concerns within the first category are identified as follows:

- In-service teacher education
- Pre-service teacher education
- Professional artists as teachers
- Other leadership development needs

These issues are not necessarily listed in priority order, but it is clear that the NAEAP finds the matter of in-service training or retraining of teachers of more immediate concern -- given the decline in public-school enrollment and the inflationary forces affecting school budgets -- than it does that relating to pre-service teacher education. (It suggests, nevertheless, that some attention should begin to be paid now,

while the heat is off, to the restructuring of teacher preparation programs so that "aspects of teaching practice which are now in serious need of remediation, and which demand that various forms of 'staff development' take place, might then begin to be corrected at the source.")

The Panel's greatest "in-service" emphasis is placed on the needs of elementary classroom teachers and secondary level subject-matter teachers, although the "renewal" and retraining needs of arts specialists -- particularly those in dance and theatre -- are not ignored. For the non-arts teacher, the Panel states that the general purpose of an expanded support for retraining opportunities is to enable such teachers to "become more familiar with one or more arts disciplines; to discover the contributions that the arts can make to other curriculum areas (including that of basic skill development); and to utilize the processes of the arts to acquire new teaching skills or different teaching styles."

In the section on "Professional Artists as Teachers," the position paper points to the enormous influence of the Endowment's Artists-in-Schools Program, but warns that "the orientation of the artist to schools and schooling is . . . a crucial issue -- as important a part of the in-service preparation of the artist who wishes to work in precollegiate education as is the in-service re-education of generalist teachers in the arts." It also "strongly supports developments . . . aimed at utilizing the services of professional artists more fully and effectively" in the re-training activities of teachers.

Under the second major category -- "Research and Development Needs" -- the paper identifies the following concerns:

- Directions for basic and applied research
- Curriculum development
- Evaluation/testing/and measurement
- Dissemination and diffusion needs

Many, though not all, of these issues, the paper indicates, "appear to fall most properly within the province of the National Institute of Education." Their identification here -- and the brief generalized treatment given them -- at the very least emphasize the Panel's sense of their importance as "agenda items" for consideration in future policy deliberations. Greater and more systematic elaboration on all of these items appears in another publication reviewed for this survey, CEMREL's book, Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future, concerned exclusively with research needs in the arts and aesthetic education.

Finally, it remains to be said that an early chapter in the AAE position paper, entitled "Lessons of the Past Decade: The Case for Planning," is concerned with a brief overview of the experimental and developmental work that has gone on in this field over the last decade, from which "the lessons for the future begin to emerge more clearly." It emphasizes the fact that "a vast amount of practical knowhow now exists . . . which can be utilized in adapting these concepts and processes to other projects and programs elsewhere." It states that "the processes of enabling successful developmental work to take place involve common

threads that cannot be ignored," and it may be instructive to conclude this review by citing the paper's listing of them directly:

> . . . building on existing strengths; utilizing full a multitude of community-based arts resources; taking pains to involve all aspects of a school's personnel in the planning [of projects]; a sustained commitment to the idea by the school system and continuing communication with school board members, parents, and the public generally; establishing workable goals and objectives and designing effective methods of assessing whether or how well they have been achieved.
>
> And perhaps most important of all, the significant lesson of the past decade seems to be that careful and detailed planning of a broadly comprehensive nature is a crucial advance component of any arts education undertaking -- state or local -- if it is to become an integral and lasting part of the educational fabric.

This position paper -- because it is essentially an overview of the crucial needs in this field and represents an attempt by leaders of the various arts education constituencies to work in greater concert -- should serve Federal decision-makers well as they deliberate on "coordinated Federal policies for support of arts education."

Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education

This remarkably cogent and forward-looking document is the product of a special Commission, appointed in late 1975 by the National Art Education Association to "make a study of the present status and prospects for the art teaching profession." It was released at the NAEA's 1977 convention in Philadelphia as a kind of "working paper" to inform the association's membership about the present status of art education nationally and to challenge the profession to think and plan constructively for the future.

Although devoted primarily to interests and concerns of educators responsible for implementing programs in the various disciplines of the visual arts in the public schools, the report frequently goes considerably beyond this kind of self-serving structure. Its pages are replete with references to the broader concerns of other arts disciplines as they relate to American education; indeed several sections of the report are devoted to questions affecting the development of "related arts programs" in the schools, and at least three of the Commission's ten major recommendations speak specifically to needs that embrace the entire field of arts education generally.

The group of art educators which prepared the report are leading members of what might well be regarded as the profession's "advance guard." The Commission's chairman was Charles Dorn, Professor of Art and Design at Purdue and the NAEA's immediate past president; its members included Elliot Eisner, Professor of Art and Education at Stanford and the Associa-

tion's current president; Albert Hurwitz, Arts Coordinator for the Newton (Mass.) Public Schools; Stanley Madeja, Director, CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program; and Anne Taylor, Associate Dean of the Graduate School at the University of New Mexico. Thirty-two other leaders in the field are listed specifically as contributors to the report -- through commissioned papers on particular issues or reviews and critiques of these papers, and in the development of recommendations for Commission consideration. Open hearings at the 1976 NAEA Convention also provided an opportunity for input from the association membership. In all, several hundred art educators were involved in the report's preparation.

As a group, these artist/teachers have been in the forefront of their profession for some years now and are responsible for most of the forward-looking developments which have emerged recently in their field. Most -- and certainly the Commission's members themselves -- would probably not object to being termed "the futurists" of their field; indeed, the Commission characterizes the final chapter of its report -- entitled "An Agenda for Change" -- as something of a "radical departure from the more or less situational character" of the report as a whole since it places on the table "the notion that an expanded definition or structure for art and art education may be necessary as advanced technology influences the discipline."

In this chapter, the Commission calls forthrightly for thinking of a more futuristc nature if art education is to meet the challenge of the twenty-first century. And in its speculations about the future, the

Commission accepts the risk "that such projections may prick the sensibilities of those in the profession who hold more traditional values and modalities of thought about the art teaching profession." But the Commission is willing to take that risk in order to challenge the profession to think anew about its current values and beliefs.

The Commission has not pretended that its report is comprehensive enough to stand as the final word in the field. It recognizes that a few important issues have only been touched upon -- career education in the arts, for example, and the role of professional artists who work in the schools -- and that real gaps may occur "between scholarly consensus on what should exist and what is actually practiced in our schools." But in its descriptions of current and varied practice in art education (which the Commission admits sometimes borders on the prescriptive), the report holds a remarkably clear mirror up to the profession, circa 1977; it also fulfills admirably the Commission's charge to provide a status report which, at the same time, examines "useful approaches the profession could generally adopt for dealing with immediate realities."

The Commission's ten major recommendations are placed right up front, in the report's concise first section. They range from concerns that relate directly to the conditions necessary for quality teaching and learning in school art programs, to a plea that the College Entrance Examination Board develop more imaginative and uniform methods of assessing high school experience in art for admission to colleges and universities.

In between, the recommendations stress the need for application of current NAEA standards in art teacher education programs, and an NAEA evaluation criteria for assessing the quality of school art programs; they call for greater cooperation among schools, arts councils, and other educational groups; and they urge that new categorical Federal legislation be enacted to support the further development of arts education in the nation's schools. In-service education programs, the dissemination and diffusion of information, and curriculum development and research are identified as perhaps the most important among those developments needing greater Federal support. Finally, an urgent plea is made to the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities to "develop among the federal agencies it coordinates a comprehensive national plan for the support of the arts in American Education."

Recommendation one is perhaps worth quoting in full because its essentially eclectic viewpoint infuses virtually all aspects of the report. That recommendation says

> The commission believes that in a pluralistic society it is appropriate that the goals we strive to achieve, the content we teach, and the methods we use will vary in accordance with the contextual setting of the school and the unique needs of the children who are to be served in that environment.
>
> The commission therefore acknowledges that there are a variety of appropriate rationales which may be equally viable as conceptual bases for teaching and learning in art within a given school context.

The main body of the Commission's report consists of a series of comprehensive "Working Papers" which present "the basic normative and

historical data and the philosophic arguments" which undergird the major recommendations. Although they are naturally somewhat parochial in their overall concern with art (rather than "arts") education, the exceptions noted earlier come through more consistently than might have been expected; and they stress repeatedly that "there is no single, adequate, comprehensive, and perennial purpose for the teaching of art. There are purposes, and these purposes change in importance with time and context."

The first of these working papers is largely a realistic appraisal of the current situation nationally with respect to art education, its present tensions and constraints given the character of schooling in America today, and its future challenges given the social status of the arts in American society. It deals pragmatically with existing data regarding the position of art education in the nation's elementary and secondary schools in an era characterized by rising educational costs and declining enrollments, by fiscal conservatism and a concern for greater emphasis on the so-called "basics" of education. It notes that recent Harris polls have pointed to the public's acceptance of the arts as necessary for improving the quality of American life, but concludes that this "is not sufficient to assure that the arts will continue to fare well in public education." That prospect, the report says, "may depend most on how effective art educators are in articulating their concerns about quality arts education programs both to the general

public and to the educational and political leadership that affects the nation's schools."

The second major working paper -- entitled "What We Believe and Why" -- is (together with the "futurism" section noted earlier) perhaps the most philosophic and penetrating of all the papers. It attempts to describe briefly some of the varied purposes of art education "that appear to be defensible, in general, for the situations in which most art educators work. We offer these purposes, the Commission states, "with both a conviction that they are important and an invitation to the field to critically challenge them."

The Commission's list of purposes has been reduced to five in number. They are: art education 1) as a source of aesthetic experience, 2) as a source of human understanding, 3) as a means of developing critical consciousness, 4) as a means of developing creative and flexible forms of thinking, and 5) as a means of helping students understand and appreciate art. Each is treated in some detail but, happily, with considerable verve and some passion.

The discussion of "art education as a source of human understanding," for example, points out that

> Until recently it was considered philosophically weak-minded to think of knowledge or understanding in terms that were not propositional. The quintessence of knowledge was to be found in physics and the other sciences. As for the arts, well, they crossed from the arena of knowledge and understanding to that of catharsis and mere expression.
>
> The consequences of these pervasive views upon the schools have been tragic; they have skewed the curriculum in such a way

> that important forms of understanding are neglected or omitted entirely, biased the criteria through which human competency is appraised, and even begun to define what will count in the conception and assessment of human intelligence.
>
> . . . Take as an example our conception of human affection; each of us has such a conception, and it is one that is formed in visual and kinesthetic terms as well as in linguistic ones. As a matter of fact, knowledge of human affection may have precious little to do with propositions, but a great deal to do with images that have no name.

This particular discussion concludes by chiding the field in none too gentle manner. "It seems to us," the Commission states, "the contributions of art to human understanding have for too long been neglected by art educators. . . . We believe that the policy should expand its conceptions of mind and knowledge. One place in which to begin is the schools. Art educators can help create a public that has some appropriate sense for art and for the functions it performs in understanding the world."

The final working paper is a kind of nuts-and-bolts attempt to define "The Criteria for Practice in the Visual Arts." It responds in brief statements to such questions as: Who Should Teach Art at the Elementary and Secondary Levels? (Qualified specialists -- with an "arts team," where possible.) What Should be Taught in the Art Program and to Whom? (Studio art, and appreciation.) Should Art Be Elective or Required? (Required!) What Is Our Position Regarding Related Arts? (Supportive -- with reservations.) It also addressed questions relating to fiscal support, administration, and how art programs should be evaluated. In essence, this section is not only a valuable resource for art educators but for schoolmen and -women generally as they attempt to come to grips

with the criteria for a sound and productive program in the visual arts.

The Appendix to the Commission's report presents a selection of varied models for programs in the visual arts which have been developed for the sixth grade -- a level chosen "because it is a critical link to the secondary program and because many ideas which are valid on the sixth grade level can be used beyond this point." A number of leading practitioners present their own personal approaches to the problem under such headings as curriculum planning, relating the arts, art and environmental awareness, role playing, the "new" art history and appreciation in sixth grade, art as a studio-based activity, and "a comprehensive-eclectic model for teaching art." Together, these differing case histories suggest the extraordinary range of possibilities and purposes open to the schools when they set about establishing imaginative visual art programs appropriate to their own time and place. These varied approaches give sound, pragmatic substance to the report's recurring theme of eclecticism.

Arts in Education Partners: Schools and Their Communities

Almost every document or publication under scrutiny here pays some kind of attention to the rich vein of arts resources which exist in American communities beyond the school-house doors -- and often right under the noses of education professionals. They point out that these resources -- individual artists, and arts institutions or organizations -- have for too long remained untapped by the education enterprise; that their potential contribution to the artistic growth and development of students is major and unique; that learning can and should take place in informal community settings as well as in school buildings; and that the time is ripe for new partnerships, between schools and these community-based arts resources, to be explored and developed.

Until now, however, there has been more exhortation about this than action -- although, to be sure, the instances of such crucial school-community partnerships (in and for the arts) are growing across the nation, and the publications under review point specifically to a number of them. It has remained, nevertheless, for an unusual consortium of arts education activists in Oklahoma City to schedule a major conference on this issue and then to draw together the pertinent conference materials and proceedings in a kind of "how-to-do-it" handbook that could help other schools and communities go forth and do likewise.

Arts in Education Partners: Schools and Their Communities is the attractive, comprehensive, and highly practical booklet which emerged from that Oklahoma City conference, convened in December of 1976 as an "Arts

in Education Symposium." Though it had its share of plenary session speakers (notably Kathryn Bloom, Arnold Webb, Michael Newton, Clyde McGeary and Bill Jamison), this was planned as a working conference, and its over 100 participants were divided into four task-force groups to consider major issues within the school-community-arts arena.

The conference's sponsoring consortium consisted of the Oklahoma City Public Schools, the Arts Council of Oklahoma City, the Junior League of Oklahoma City, and two not-so-improbable national partners -- the Association of Junior Leagues and the JDR 3rd Fund. Some readers may legitimately be puzzled, initially, about the involvement of the Junior Leagues in all this -- but they won't be for long. The opening chapter of the booklet consists, first, of a talk by Kathryn Bloom (director of the JDR 3rd Fund's nine-year-old Arts in Education Program) entitled "The Arts in Education: A New Movement" -- and a movement, of course, which she herself has spearheaded since her days as head of the Office of Education's redoubtable Arts and Humanities Program in the mid-Sixties. Following an account of key arts education developments during and since that time, she describes in some detail why and how the Junior Leagues have become major arts-in-education partners in a number of American communities.

"In almost any community, large or small," she points out, "there are voluntary organizations that have been formed to meet the interests and/or needs of their members and to provide services to their communities. Among them, the Junior Leagues have been the most active by far in working with school systems to develop arts in education programs."

She notes later on that League projects which provide arts resources to the schools, either jointly with arts organizations or as direct services, ordinarily include financial support (mainly start-up funds which are gradually phased out) as well as administrative and volunteer services. (Miss Bloom knows intimately the role and functions of Junior League organizations because, prior to assuming her USOE post, she held the position of Consultant on the Arts with the Leagues' national association.)

In a later chapter, Susan Greene, who is president of the Association of Junior Leagues, gives some of the history of the Leagues' involvement with the arts -- from the 1930's when it spearheaded the children's theatre movement to the 1976 Oklahoma City conference. And she concludes her aptly-titled talk on the "Honorable History and Promising Future" of the Leagues' partnership efforts with the following statement:

> We know from past experience that the most successful programs are those in which all parties enter the planning process together. Our enthusiasm for infusing the educational curriculum with the arts, and our know-how as volunteers coupled with the expertise of the professionals, will provide the necessary catalytic action to make it happen.

Arts in Education Partners documents such League involvement by including a series of five detailed case studies in which Junior Leagues have assumed unusual responsibilities in working with their school systems to develop major arts in education programs. These descriptions of "arts in education partnerships in action" include aesthetic education programs in Birmingham and Memphis, Oklahoma City s "Opening Doors in Education" program, the Arts in Education program in Little Rock, and

an "Arts for Learning" program in Seattle. Briefer summaries of similar projects in St. Louis, Tulsa, Pittsburgh, and Los Angeles are also provided. The five major studies in particular are "how-to-do-it" accounts of the most detailed kind, outlining clearly how the programs were planned and implemented (goals and objectives and a timetable for accomplishing them are given for some projects). They also explain how volunteers and community resources were used, how the funding was developed, how staff training was conducted, what curriculum materials were created and how, what the evaluation process was, and even the part played by "communications and public information."

This is all a part of the first large chapter which takes up well over half of the booklet. It is effectively highlighted by some remarkable photographs of students, teachers, and artists who have been involved in these programs. The chapter concludes with a useful outline, developed by the Fund, which provides criteria for determining the educational effectiveness of community arts programs in the schools -- that is, the features of arts programs operating at a high level, a middle level, and a low level of effectiveness.

Miss Greene's observations, referred to a moment ago, come at the end of the chapter entitled simply "The Partnership," and the other two relevant parties to such evolving covenants (an experienced schoolman and an equally experienced arts council leader) present their views on the matter earlier on. The schoolman is Dr. Arnold Webb, who is currently Executive Director of the Division of Educational Planning and Support in

the New York City Schools, and the arts council leader is Michael Newton, president of the Associated Councils of the Arts (now the American Council for the Arts).

Each from his own embattled perspective, these rather hard-headed professionals bring their own experience to bear on what Webb calls the "shared power concept" between the school system and the arts resource groups in the community. Webb describes with considerable passion the incredible problems that face the monolithic New York City Schools and others like them -- but he is equally eloquent about what can be done for the arts in education in such large systems if there is joint planning with some of education's community-based partners. And Newton concludes his insights into the problems and prospects of community arts councils, their opportunities for assisting in the development of school programs, and the forces which might often mitigate against this, on a thoughtful note:

> There exists for us to tap a will and an energy great enough to ensure that the next generation of Americans does not walk to school, and later on to work, blind and deaf to the incredible richness of their lives . . . to ensure that every child may master the secret that is at the heart of education, of art and of life itself: to be able to look at an idea that is new and unfamiliar and not be afraid.

A different perspective on the matter is presented in the next chapter -- that of state education agencies and state arts councils -- by Clyde McGeary, a widely respected arts educator who now heads the Division of General Education in the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and by Bill Jamison, former director of the Oklahoma Arts and Humanities Council and now Southwest Regional Coordinator for the National Endowment

for the Arts. Their concerns are chiefly those related to the additional resources and opportunities -- beyond both school and community -- which can be drawn upon to assist in program development. McGeary tells us that "the concept of bureaucracy as an impenetrable and insensitive organization of self-serving people hired to create and sustain red tape is largely a myth." Out of his own long experience, he assures us that "cooperation with state departments of education is possible and a realistic challenge." Jamison's comments are largely devoted to an explanation of the Artists-in-Schools Program, and he is unusually candid in his advice to school systems about the pitfalls as well as the advantages of school residencies for artists.

The final chapter of this valuable handbook is called "A Working Conference," and it sums up the observations which came out of the four discussion groups or task forces into which the symposium participants were divided. Here again there are important insights on such components of program development as Planning (perhaps the ultimate key to success), Research, Evaluation and Dissemination, Identification, and Use of Resources, Communication, and Implementation.

Arts in Education Partners has a brief introduction by Sharon Seminoff, a Junior League member in Oklahoma City who served as chairman for the 1976 symposium. The handbook as a whole has been skillfully edited by Nancy Shuker for the JDR 3rd Fund, which published it.

With this publication at hand, one is forced to observe that -- if programs in some of the other 231 cities in which the Junior League is

active aren't being developed with equal effectiveness -- the potential partnership members can't in the future fall back on the excuse that nobody told them!

Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future

"The history of the research idea in arts education is brief," observes Harlan Hoffa, in an early chapter of this book recently published by CEMREL. "It emerged out of several unrelated postwar (WW II) factors including a panicky reform of science education that eventually affected other fields; a new research orientation within arts education that developed, in part, out of influences imported by European scholars and researchers before and after the war; and, finally, a new mandate for federal support of the arts that evolved in the Kennedy Administration. Research in arts education blossomed very rapidly in the 1960s and withered almost as quickly in the 1970s; but, as long as hope springs eternal, a workable research program in arts education still seems possible."

It was to move that possibility closer to reality, and to construct a national agenda for such a program, that CEMREL and the Education Program of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies jointly sponsored a national week-long conference at Aspen, Colorado, in June of 1976. It was supported by the National Institute of Education (NIE) and attended by nearly a hundred specially invited participants -- leading authorities and practitioners from the interlocking worlds of research, education, and the arts. The proceedings of that conference -- commissioned background papers and digests of the four major seminar groups into which the participants were divided -- have been brought together in this curiously titled book.

It is curiously titled because the overwhelming emphasis of the conference (and thus of the book itself) is on research and development in the arts and aesthetic education, and potential research-minded readers of the book, which one hopes would be numerous, will have little to guide them to it from the listed title. Only in a small sub-sub-title on the title page is it stated that this volume is intended as a "first yearbook on research" in this important field.

That minor quibble aside, Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future is a fascinating and absorbing compendium of the surveys and historical development, the methodological issues, and the major researchable problems which infuse and surround this aspect of the arts in education. And, drawing on all of this material -- but particularly on the four seminar reports which reflect the thinking of the participants on the content of the proposed research, its methods, and priorities -- a number of issues emerged that, indeed, provide the basis for at least a tentative research and development agenda in the arts and education.

The book's editor is Stanley S. Madeja, a Vice President of CEMREL and for eight years the Director of its Aesthetic Education Program, who also served as chairman of the Aspen Conference. He has been ably assisted by an Editorial Committee consisting of Harry Broudy, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy and Education at the University of Illinois, Mark Schubart, Director of Education at Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts; and Annette Schroeder and Sheila Onuska, who serve the CEMREL organization as editors.

Madeja's 20-page introduction to the volume presents an admirable summary of the conference proceedings, its seminar reports, and ultimate outcomes for those who -- for reasons of time or inclination -- may not get around to delving further. (This is an option that should not, of course, be followed by anyone seriously concerned with this field, because its threads are many and varied and they affect virtually all elements of "the arts, aesthetics, and their place in educational enrichment of our nation.")

The conference agenda was organized around five central questions. They served to guide the content of the background papers -- which make up the bulk of the present volume -- and the substance of the seminar discussions. Those questions were as follows:

1. As we look ahead, what do we see as the major research questions in the arts and/or aesthetics?

2. What do we see as the rationale for conducting research on any one or more of these questions over the next ten years?

3. What effects, if any, do we expect research results to have on the general education of any student at any level?

4. What connections do these questions have to what has already been done in this field?

5. What should be the design for an institute for advanced studies in the arts and aesthetics?

Madeja's introduction includes summaries, prepared by each group, of the differing ways in which all four of the seminars at Aspen dealt with these questions. Each group had its own view of the design for a future "institute" that would probe more deeply over time into virtually all

of the research questions, issues, and problems under consideration; several even sketched out schematic models for the governance and staffing functions of such an institute. Indeed, one seminar concentrated its work entirely on this question, spelling out in some detail what the national research focus of an institute should be, and describing its potential as a national clearinghouse for research in the arts and its possible function in fulfilling the research needs of arts practitioners by providing ongoing workshops, seminars, and other programs that would help develop their technical research background. This group also made suggestions on governance, called for better communications among groups involved in this field, advocated a "visiting fellows" program for the institute, and urged that its research efforts be "confined to existing settings rather than creating arbitrary experimental environments."

Another seminar group reported its findings as a list of 16 probing questions that dealt with high priority research issues. Still another responded by identifying the following two categories as crucial topics for research: Acquisition and Dissemination of Baseline Normative and/or Descriptive Data; and Basic Research in the Arts and Aesthetic Education. It called for research in the latter category to be concentrated in such areas as: studies in the philosophy of art; the development of aesthetic sensitivity, perception, and cognition; the effectiveness of teaching strategies in the arts; the conceptual basis for curriculum development; the relationship of culture to the arts; and the development of better tools and methods for assessing the progress of arts learning.

The fourth seminar organized the substance of its deliberations around four large research categories: aesthetic education, interdisciplinary education, evaluation, and methods. After compiling a number of subtopics under each category, the group took the categories and structured them into five major issues under which specific "topics for research" relating to the arts and aesthetic education were proposed. These five issues dealt with the nature of the phenomena, the nature of learning, the nature of delivery to its constituencies, the nature of assessing and evaluating, and the impact of the arts and aesthetic education. The group then posed some priority "research examples," many of them in the form of questions, under each of these major headings.

From all of this raw material, Madeja, in his introductory chapter, has attempted to sketch out the parameters for a research agenda in this field. His conclusions, and excerpts from the supporting statements, follow:

> The conference. . .strongly advocated support for the basic research needed for continued expansion of the knowledge base in the arts and aesthetic education.
>
> While there is a need for applied and practical studies. . . at every level, there is still a critical shortage of the scholarly inquiry that, over time, provides the theoretical voice for the field. . . . Increased support for basic research projects initiated by individuals or institutions in the field was deemed critical by the conference participants since there has been little opportunity for basic research funding at national or state levels for at least five years. . . . This concern should not be neglected or set aside.

Related to [this issue] is the question of modes of inquiry for research in the arts and aesthetic education.

Research. . .should not be limited to the manipulation of data; it should include all the domains of inquiry, analysis, and method as they relate [to this field] . . . . Conference participants . . .argued the need to maintain a balance between empirical types of studies and those that were more anthropological, sociological, or historical in approach.

The general advocacy for basic research was tempered by the concern that there was a break in the flow of information between researcher and audience.

A very small amount of research activity in the arts is initiated by either school personnel or outside researchers. . . [Thus] the critical need to initiate more school-based studies whose outcome would be the improvement of arts instruction. . . Further investigation of the areas of cooperation between schools and research should have a prominent place on any future agenda. . .

Another major issue that evolved from the conference. . .was the varying quantities of research in some areas of arts education.

. . .it [is] evident that more research was being initiated in visual arts and music education than in theatre or dance education. . . . Improving the climate and capabilities for research in theatre and dance was, therefore, a major concern at the conference.

The role of the artist in research was another theme that developed during the conference.

In the minds of most. . .participants. . .the artist is not to be confined to being the subject of research. . . [He] could conduct "research" . . .although the means might differ from more clinical approaches. . . Both groups--researchers and artist/researchers--must work to make their contributions applicable to the concerns of education.

The conference participants were also particularly aware of the need to provide the results of research in the arts and aesthetics to the classroom, the school, and the whole field.

Participants saw the need for a simple method of collecting [raw baseline data] and for a simple process of disseminating it to all constituencies in the arts field. . . The need to establish a clearinghouse for the arts and aesthetic education was a dominant issue throughout the seminar discussions.

Related to all. . .the discussions was the question of how research priorities should be set and by whom.

The participants felt that the future of the field required a more coordinated approach to research.

The specific Research Agenda which ultimately emerged from the Aspen Conference focused on seven primary research areas, not necessarily listed in priority order:

1. Testing and Revising Theories of Aesthetic Development in Students.

2. Optimizing the Learning Experience Within the Schools Through Aesthetic Education and the Arts.

3. Investigating the Relationship of Cultural Values to Aesthetic Learning.

4. Improvement of Evaluation in the Arts and Aesthetics.

5. Preparation of an Educational Policy in the Arts and Aesthetics for the Public Schools.

6. Establishment of a Mechanism for Data Collection in the Arts and Aesthetic Education that will Relate to Existing Systems such as the National Center for Education Statistics in the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

7. Creation of a National Center for Research in the Arts and Aesthetics.

The volume as a whole is then concerned with the four speeches given at general sessions of the conference and the commissioned background papers -- all of which, in one way or another, speak to one or more of the needs identified in the ultimate agenda topics. The commissioned papers are organized into three major sections -- those dealing with the

history of research in this field and surveys of existing research in arts, music, theatre, and dance education, plus several overviews of institutional research by Federal agencies; those dealing with methodological issues in the arts and aesthetics; and those dealing with promising researchable problems in the field. Each of these sections is prefaced by short "overviews" which summarize the salient points of the papers.

The concerned reader will find herein the considered reflections of Frank Keppel, Kathryn Bloom, Morris Weitz, Martin Engel, and David Rockefeller, Jr., on aspects of arts education that relate to research. More specifically, there are such other respected authorities in the field as Arthur (Wells) Foshay writing on an "Inquiry into Aesthetic Education for Curriculum-Making"; Harry Broudy on "Some Reactions to a Concept of Aesthetic Education"; Howard Gardner on "Sifting the Special from the Shared"; Ralph and C.M. Smith on "The Artworld and Aesthetic Skills"; Anne Taylor on "Aesthetic Learning Environments"; John Cataldo on "Major Research Questions: To Form New Alliances"; Elliot Eisner on "Thoughts for an Agenda on R & D in Arts Education"; and Harold Hodgkinson (then-director of NIE) on "Arts in the Future: A Pragmatic Analysis."

Three spokespersons for the role of minority Americans in this field have contributed thoughtful and discerning papers to the volume: Margaret Bush Wilson, Chairman of the NAACP's National Board of Directors, writes on "The Arts and the Minorities"; Samella Lewis, Professor of Art History at Scripps College, provides the perspective of an educator of African-American heritage in "Art and Aesthetics (A Minority Report)";

and Lionel Landry, Executive Vice-President of The Asia Society, discusses "The Arts in Multicultural Education: The Case for Asia."

For those with an interest in bibliographies, D. Jack Davis appends a lengthy one to his paper on "Research Trends in Art and Art Education: 1883-1972." Davis lists some 520 items resulting from a review of the literature in that field. And Charles Leonhard and Richard Colwell provide a bibliography of some 150 items following their survey of "Research in Music Education." (For reasons noted earlier, neither Gil Lazier -- on Theatre -- nor Alma Hawkins -- on Dance -- could have been expected to provide much at all in the way of bibliographies for their reviews of research in those fields -- and they haven't).

It should be noted that a second Aspen Conference, focused more intensively on cognitively oriented researchable problems in this field, was held in June of 1977. It is to be hoped that its outcomes will result in a second "yearbook" that probes that specific aspect of this field as exhaustively as the broad, agenda-setting overview has been treated in this one.

Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter

It's almost a truism that nobody can make accounts of research projects interesting to the layman -- and that goes for research in almost any field you want to name, whether it's basic (or the so-called "pure") research or even the less pure applied or developmental variety. Educational research is apt to be as abstruse, in its reporting prose, as anything else. And, when it comes to the Johnny-come-lately field of research in arts education -- where "the most pervasive difficulty is the notion that research runs counter to the very essence and spirit of art" -- practitioners looking for ways to use its results in their classrooms on Monday may well decide to throw in the towel.

But listen, if you will, to this:

> It is therefore probably all to the good that the Arts and Humanities Program [of USOE] molded R. & D. to its own purposes, putting the development cart before the research horse. Classically--in medicine and rocketry as well as in industry, commerce, and in communications--research generates a new product, an idea, or a method. Each must go through a design-and-testing stage to verify its initial value and to minimize bugs; then, through broader trial-runs in a selected marketplace (shopping mart, clinic, highway, proving ground) and back to the drawingboard/laboratory for modifications. Finally, a pill, missile, doll, computer, station wagon, or advertising slogan emerges as having been readied for general consumption.
>
> In the AHP sequence, "D" comes before "R." That part of the program called "developmental activities" had as its prime goal to spur useful and usable research. (Thereafter, presumably, the accepted cycle would proceed).

And to this:

> In his own way [Penn State researcher Kenneth] Beittel personifies shifting approaches to research in art, and

> by and large arts, education in the past few decades. In the fifties researchers were striving for improved quality and respectability. This movement had two related aspects. One was substantive -- the effort to relate purpose and validity as closely as possible to psychology and other disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences. The other was procedural -- the effort to emulate the technical apparatus of empirical research by mastering the statistics and other arcana of 'hard' sciences. In the age of Sputnik, the strategy was if-you-can't-lick-'em-join-'em. By the 1970's, however, there were signs that arts research had come sharply about if not full circle.

These selections are drawn pretty much at random from the pages of a forthcoming U.S. Government Printing Office publication by Judith Murphy and Lonna Jones entitled Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter, which was previewed in manuscript form for this survey. "The Federal Chapter" referred to in the title is the extraordinary period (1963-1970) at the Office of Education when OE's Bureau of Research established the Arts and Humanities Program and some $11 million of ESEA Title IV funds were used to support the first major research and development program in arts education in the nation's history.

The report is the product of an OE contract with the now-defunct Arts/Worth Project of the American Council for the Arts in Education (the same organization, incidentally, which sponsored the more recent work of the Arts, Education and Americans Panel, whose final report, Coming to Our Senses, was published last May and is reviewed earlier in these pages).

Judith Murphy is a professional free-lance writer who has been associated with the Academy for Educational Development and the Educational

Facilities Laboratories (among other affiliations) and has produced, often in collaboration with others, a notable series of studies, reports, and publications in the field of education. (Among them are "The Tanglewood Symposium: Music in American Society" and "The Arts and the Poor: New Challenge for Educators," accounts of two developmental conferences that took place during the period covered by the new report). In the present instance, Judith Murphy has had the able collaborative assistance of Lonna Jones, who is currently an education program officer working with Harold Arberg in the office of HEW's Arts and Humanities Staff, the name given to the non-research arts and humanities presence at USOE following the demise of the original Arts and Humanities Program.

Their account of this seminal research and development program carried out in the late sixties, under the wise and always pragmatic direction of Kathryn Bloom, is a remarkable document by any criteria. It is eminently readable from beginning to end of its 120-manuscript pages, full of color and verve, yet staying firmly on its intended informational mission: to review and assay what happened in the course of AHP's rise, its heyday, and its rather abrupt demise. For one section -- that dealing with the Program's so-called "developmental activities" (both surveys and conferences) -- Murphy and Jones have drawn heavily on the work of Harlan Hoffa, whose 1970 report, An Analysis of Recent Research Conferences in Arts Education, covers 17 OE-sponsored conferences held in the mid-sixties. Their description of the Hoffa document ("an unusually forthright, informative, and candid report, written with humor and authority and setting the conferences

within their governmental and educational context") can be applied without qualification to their own report.*

The Murphy-Jones report describes, initially, how it was that such an enterprise as the AHP could come into being in the first place: the heady climate of the post-Kennedy, early-Johnson years, the influence of August Heckscher and his 1963 report on "the entire range of governmental policies and programs involving the arts," the invaluable top-level support of education commissioners Keppel and Howe, and the fortuitous circumstance that placed Kathryn Bloom in precisely the right place at the right time.

Following an overview of the program's 200-odd research and development projects (and a tip of their hat to the "lively crew" of AHP professionals who, though nominally pigeonholed as specialists, "got into everybody else's act"), the authors begin forthrightly but selectively to deal with these projects "under the broadly interpreted rubrics of basic research, so-called developmental activities, and applied research, where the predominant emphasis was curriculum development."

Throughout, they have had the sound idea of asking many of the project or conference directors for some hindsight comment, and the retrospective observations of these arts education researchers (like Arnheim, Beittel, Eisner, Palisca, Goodman, Hawkins, Zimmerman, Blitzer, Mattil, Thomas, Hoetker) and others, including Miss Bloom herself, are sprinkled judiciously and summatively across the pages of the report.

---

*All right -- enough of this "love letter"; back to objectivity. For one who was there, on the AHP staff from 1965 to 1969, however, it is difficult to remain objective, especially when so much of the Murphy-Jones report reflects so accurately the climate, the substance, and the outcomes of that time and that particular undertaking. --JE

Only five projects are scrutinized in the chapter dealing with basic research: Arnheim's and Beittel's pioneering studies in the visual arts; Petzold's (on the ways yound children perceive musical symbols) and Zimmerman's (on how children conceptually organize musical sounds) in music education; and the studies in "aesthetic education" undertaken by Goodman, Perkins, and Gardner at Harvard's Project Zero.

The chapter on surveys and developmental conferences, and that on "The What and How of Education in the Arts" (reviewing those "applied" research projects concerned with measurement and testing, instructional methods, and curriculum development) both embrace a considerably larger number of projects.

One reason may be that the "applied research" projects funded by AHP bulked largest by far -- well over half the total over the life of the program -- while basic research studies amounted to perhaps 20 percent of the total; but then, so did "developmental activities," and perhaps its more extended treatment is simply because all those conferences seemed to be somewhat more fascinating in terms of controversy; certainly they had their share of hits and misses in the matter of impact and the authors are understandably intrigued by the fact that few of them served to generate the "important new research projects" that were ostensibly their purpose. In Miss Bloom's view now, at any rate, it was the "tangential and indirect" consequences of the conferences that seem most valuable -- particularly those involving the development of an informed and energetic constituency which has helped the whole arts-in-education movement come of age in recent years.

In a final "postscript," Murphy and Jones review what has happened to research in arts education since the OE money ran out in the early 1970's and top-level leadership in HEW essentially let the idea die. They note the shift of educational research responsibilities to the newly created National Institute of Education (also a creature of HEW) and the general attitude there that -- despite continuing support in NIE's Basic Skills Program for Project Zero, CEMREL, and SWRL -- "the arts and humanities, while generally recognized as important, must take a subordinate position among our priority research and development needs." (The words are those contained in "a 1975 letter from the [NIE] director's office to a prominent arts educator" -- and nothing seems to have altered this position in the two years since).

The authors sum up this "unique chapter in Federal support" in these words:

> In truth. . .this account has been not only selective but inconclusive as well, as befits any assessment of research, especially such recent research in so amorphous a field as arts education. Occasionally there was a tangible outcome to record, some evidence that certain findings had been proved out and put to practical application. But often these were research undertakings with quite delimited goals. Other projects probing more profound or comprehensive answers may not make their practical effects known for years to come, if then. Still others made their effects tangentially, as catalysts or pump-primers. So in a larger sense the story is open-ended: "One will see."

And they end with these thoughts:

> If, therefore, in the best of all possible worlds there should be a healthy spurt in the quantity and, more important, the quality of arts-education research, the AHP record distilled in the foregoing pages can provide valid clues as to what to do and what not to do, what works and what doesn't, where promising directions lie, what cul-de-sacs to skirt. Attention to this closed chapter of Federal support could, at the least, eliminate or reduce perennial efforts to beat the dead horses

> of research and to repeat history. At best it could form a useful springboard toward real advance in plumbing the mysterious power of the arts in human development.

A fascinating document, this; and there is some prospect that there may indeed be a new chapter -- if the preceding report's "agenda" achieves its intended and ultimate purpose. One hopes that the riders of that "new wave," when and if it begins to crest, will keep a clear weather eye on the trough immediately behind them as they close in on the shore.

Try A New Face

In mid-1976, at the behest of the Arts and Humanities Staff of the U.S. Office of Education, a contract was awarded to the Music Educators National Conference -- in cooperation with three other national arts education associations* -- to engage in a somewhat unusual undertaking.

Ostensibly, its activities were concerned with reviewing and reporting on a representative sampling of noteworthy arts education programs which had, in recent years, been the recipients of financial support from one or another of the multi-faceted programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This "Arts and HEW" project had several interlocking purposes, however, and that's why it might be characterized as "somewhat unusual."

The resulting report was to be made available to the public in the hope that its "case history" narratives would be useful to a number of varied constituencies -- particularly those concerned with the arts in education -- as they plan, develop, and implement programs of their own in this field. There is little doubt that this report -- Try A New Face, to be issued as a U.S. Government Printing Office publication early in 1978 and previewed in draft form for this "publications" survey -- will serve such purposes admirably. State and national leaders in the arts and education fields, school planners and curriculum developers, faculty members of teacher education institutions, state and local school board members, interested citizens -- and certainly Congressional leaders involved with

*National Art Education Association; the American Theatre Association; and the National Dance Association.

educational legislation -- all will find valuable and quite pragmatic insights about the educational role of the arts from this forthcoming publication.

Significantly, however, this final report on the "Arts and HEW" project is being directed officially to HEW itself, for use with its own officials and employees. The intent of this is to provide fresh and convincing insights about the educational and societal values of the arts which would assist HEW decision-makers in devising new ways of meeting the objectives of that agency's wide-ranging programs -- in and through the arts. To this end, the four national arts education associations which cooperated on the "Arts and HEW" project were asked to develop a format for a two-day "Arts Education Conference" of USOE and other HEW officials, for whom Try A New Face would become the primary resource and background document. Furthermore, the project was asked to develop a plan for "instituting a number of continuing activities designed to make all HEW employees more 'arts conscious' and responsive to arts." The report proposes that the latter program "concern itself with what art can mean to employees at work and at home. It should highlight the arts as they function in the schools and in relation to the broad general public which HEW exists to serve."

In the early first-draft form of Try A New Face, the project's staff and sponsoring organizations have sketched out in some detail what would be involved in the proposed HEW conference and the subsequent employee-orientation program. Further funding would be required to carry out both

of these undertakings and whether the proposal will ultimately come to fruition is, of course, a matter which the agency will be considering when the report is finally received later this year. If, indeed, they do come to pass, they would represent something of a precedent-setting example within the Federal establishment.

Meanwhile, in anticipation of the forthcoming availability of Try A New Face to the public-at-large, a brief overview of its contents may now be in order. For those who are truly interested in learning something of the scope and variety of arts education programs around the country, this publication will be absorbing and reassuring reading. And those in process of "inventing the wheel" themselves in their own localities will find in its pages a host of valuable clues and insights that may prove helpful.

The project itself was organized and guided by a Steering Committee (composed of the executive directors of the four sponsoring associations and Harold Arberg of the Office of Education) and by Charles L. Gary, former executive director of the MENC who served as Project Coordinator.

The major portion of the narrative "case histories" in Try A New Face is the work of four visitor/consultants who served as a reporting team for the project: Sara Chapman, who teaches dance at Temple University, Charles Fowler, a professional journalist and writer specializing in arts education; Harlan Hoffa, who heads the Division of Art and Music Education at Penn State University; and Junius Eddy, an independent consultant for education and the arts. As a group -- but singly in all but one

instance -- they visited 23 of the 25 sites ultimately selected by the Steering Committee for in-depth review and observation.

These 25 programs and projects were pulled from a list of nearly 120 noteworthy programs in all sections of the country; nominations were made by state and national leaders of the four professional associations and by officials in every state. Descriptive materials were submitted by the staff of all nominated projects -- and brief descriptions of 46 of those projects are included in the volume as well. All the nominated projects and programs are listed in the Appendix, by state, with the names and addresses of project contact people for readers seeking further information.

Several factors influenced the selection of the 25 visitation sites: wide representation of all relevant HEW programs; inclusion of both elementary and secondary -- and a few K-12 -- programs; and recognition of some significant non-school-based projects. In the latter group are such enterprises as the Cultural Voucher Program of New York City's Museums Collaborative (funded by FIPSE -- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education); an "Artists and the Aging" Project in St. Paul, Minnesota, supported by the Administration on Aging; and two programs funded by the National Institute of Education -- the aesthetic education curriculum project at CEMREL, and Harvard's Project Zero, described as "apparently the only organized program now underway anywhere in the country dealing with basic research in arts education."

Another factor in selection stemmed from the desire to represent as many different kinds of arts disciplines as possible -- and the interested reader will therefore find descriptions of single art-form projects (a theatre project in Lansing, for example), multi-arts projects ("Performing Arts for Curriculum Use" in Indianapolis), as well as those which attempt to relate or combine the arts in an interdisciplinary manner (the MOPPET program in the elementary schools of Woodbridge Township, New Jersey).

Beyond this, there are accounts of projects in which the arts have been used instrumentally -- to develop basic academic skills, for instance. Examples of this are the Open City Project in New York City's Community School District #4 (El Barrio) where reading scores of primary youngsters have risen dramatically after a year-long exposure to New York's cultural milieu and follow-up curriculum work in the arts; the ACCENT program to develop communications skills in West Virginia's Kanawha County Schools; and a project in which music is used to help children overcome learning disabilities in Phoenix, Arizona.

Other projects in which the instrumental use of the arts is highlighted include a dance program for severely handicapped persons, both children and adults, in Salt Lake City; an "Arts for Special Education" project in seven Seattle elementary schools; and the "Artists and the Aging" project cited above.

And finally, there are projects focused on career education (Providence's Center for Career Education in the Arts, for example), and others in which the in-service retraining of classroom teachers is the primary

project objective, such as Project ARTS in the Montgomery County (Md.) schools and AFCAT (Aesthetics For Children and Teachers) at the Wheelock Elementary School in Keene, New Hampshire.

One of the most interesting sections of Try A New Face comes at the very beginning, in which three of the five former IMPACT Project Schools -- in Columbus (Ohio), Glendale (California), and Eugene (Oregon) -- are revisited. These projects were the result of the first cooperative effort of the four professional arts education associations, in which five school districts around the country were selected for landmark pilot projects to develop, over a two-year period in the early 1970s, "interdisciplinary model programs in the arts for children and teachers" (IMPACT). They were heavily supported ($200,000 for each over the two-year period) by funds from the Teacher Retraining Authorization of the then-Education Professions Development Act. The question was: "What happened to these projects when "the Federal bucks" ran out, OE monitoring ceased, the four associations' advisory services were withdrawn, and coordinating assistance by the JDR 3rd Fund came to an end.

In a word, they are apparently "continuing" -- each in its own way and with considerable success, notably in Columbus and Glendale (where local schools took up most of the financial slack and, in recent years, have installed the IMPACT concepts in other parts of their systems). There is extremely valuable "how-to-do-it" information in these three chapters, and welcome (if somewhat tentative) evidence, particularly in Columbus, of rising test scores in vocabulary, computation, and reading

comprehension among youngsters in the initial IMPACT schools.

In a preface to the publication, the project's reporting team points to two elements which seemed to characterize those programs in which "things seemed to be running smoothly -- and they were in the majority." The first was "a major effort to inform and enlist the support and understanding of the community-at-large. . .parents, interested colleagues, and other citizens . . . ." Second, the school-based projects in particular have "also placed a high priority on involving and working closely with the existing staff of arts specialists." The team also noted that many of the projects visited seemed to be "floundering a bit" with respect to assessment matters and warned that "educational programs and projects in the arts need badly to have more attention paid to their unique requirements in the area of evaluation."

Charles Gary, in his summary chapter, also points to the "extreme uneveness in the matter of evaluation" and he asks some pointed questions about it. He also notes that "the doubts stemming from evaluation inadequacies can't dampen the incredibly positive feeling that pervades these reports." He was struck by the enthusiasm and resourcefulness of the people engaged in carrying out the projects, "even in the face of reductions in arts staff or eliminated programs in many parts of the country." He notes "the integration of learning possibilities provided by the arts" and the restoration of "balance" to the curricula in these projects. He urges caution with respect to the test-score issue and highlights both the problems and the prospects for the growing use of

professional artists in educational settings.

Gary concludes on an optimistic note. These projects, he says, "even though inadequately validated in many instances, are the kind of thing from which optimism is born, even in the face of severe frustration. . . . Perhaps a new social institution to replace the schools in this democracy is not needed. Maybe a new face is all that is required."

The phrase -- which gives the book its title -- is taken from a remark Congressman John Brademas made in 1974: "Pilot projects have proven the arts can change the face of education and present an exciting new way of learning." These accounts offer evidence that in some places in the nation, at least, this indeed has been happening.

The Arts Endowment and Education

This document is an unpublished (mimeographed) policy paper of the National Endowment for the Arts which has not been made publicly available -- and it may therefore be something of an anomaly in the context of this review of current publications.

It results from an in-house study carried out during 1976 to scrutinize "the agency's grant-making patterns in support of activities which can be termed education." It is the only document of this nature under consideration here, and while others of its type -- if they exist -- would be useful to those considering more coordinated Federal policies for arts education, its limited circulation necessarily restricts its usefulness by a broader public.

Nonetheless, a brief report on its scope and its findings and recommendations seems in order. The study itself was conducted under the direction of A. B. Spellman, a poet and former university history teacher who was, at the time of the study, chairman of the Endowment's Expansion Arts Panel.* Its findings were subjected to "critical review on several occasions by an outside advisory group of nationally recognized arts and education authorities."

The entire 11-year history of the Endowment came within the scope of the study, although "particular emphasis was placed on the period FY 1971 to 1975, when overall Arts Endowment appropriations rose dramatically relative to the five-year period following its establishment in

---

*He is now co-director of the Expansion Arts Program.

1965." (Appropriations were $ million in fiscal 1971 and increased to $ million in FY 1975.)

The study itself was conducted in two parts, covering Endowment-supported activities of a general educational nature -- in terms of society and the public -- and those more specifically directed to school-aged children and youth. The position paper largely maintains these distinctions, presenting an overview and a brief history of activities under each heading and concluding with a summary and recommendations in both categories.

The paper notes that it was apparently "the intent of the Congress that the National Endowment for the Arts have a central role in making the arts available to all regions and sections of the American population" and that this process "would allow for activist policies as well as awarding grants to deserving artists and cultural institutions." It observes that subsequent agency policy has clearly been of assistance in extending the arts "deeply into the lives and environments of many Americans who otherwise would have little exposure to them."

It is essentially this element of "exposure" that characterizes the Endowment efforts described under the first major heading of the position paper -- that concerned with "The Role of the Arts Endowment in Educating the General Public in and to the Arts." The paper points out that in fiscal 1971, 340 such "exposure projects" were supported -- or one-half of the total awards that year -- and by 1975 some 1,122 such projects were supported "in activities which go beyond the normal seasons of

arts organizations." The Endowment's other nonschool-related education activities were mainly those supporting classes or workshops in the disciplines of the arts (26 projects in FY 1971, and 380 in FY 1975 -- most of them in the Expansion Arts Program).

The paper emphasizes that its discussion of "exposure" projects and grants treats "education from the perspective of arts organizations which often address their efforts to large and transient groups. . . [and that] professional educators, whose discipline is designed for the more stable and controlled school environment, may find such activities inconsistent with their view of education."

In further elaboration on "The Question of Exposure," the paper suggests that such activities can generally be divided into two different kinds: "out-reach" projects and "in-reach" projects. "Out-reach" refers to projects in which "the cultural organizations and institutions endeavor to cultivate wider audiences for the art to which they are committed." "In-reach" projects, on the other hand, are those "established within particular communities which ordinarily do not have arts institutions with the concurrence and in-put of representatives of those communities." Most of this programming was designed to meet "the cultural needs and heritages" of these communities.

The second part of the paper is concerned with "Support of Activities Directed Toward Schools and School-Aged Youth" and it is important to bear in mind, in this connection, the particular definition of "education" which was used for the study as a whole. The study defines as

educational "only those projects that actively and purposefully teach." In elaborating on this, the paper states that "the Arts Endowment's educational practices can best be seen as an aspect of its effort to expand the availability of the nation's cultural resources rather than as a concentrated approach to teaching and learning. The distinction is important, for 'education' in the Arts Endowment's lexicon is education from the perspective of the arts organizations which comprise its primary clientele; only occasionally is it education from the stricter perspective of those who are professionally involved in formal schooling." This distinction apparently was applied not only to education programming of a general nature, but to school-oriented projects as well.

In identifying the various ways in which the Arts Endowment has been involved with the public schools, the paper mentions the following forms:

* Provision for artists to perform, create, and display their work in schools.

* Provision for cultural organizations to offer their resources and services to schools, both inside and outside the school structure.

* Support for research, demonstration projects, planning and development projects and other activities designed to have far-reaching impact upon the status of the arts in schools.

* Informational dissemination, staff outreach, and other forms of active advocacy for the cause of arts in the lives of American youth.

A brief historical overview describes aspects of this involvement, beginning with the early collaborative ventures between the Arts Endow-

ment and the Office of Education to support the Educational Laboratory Theatre Project and the use of OE transfer funds which, in the early '70s, led to the establishment of the Artists-in-Schools Program. More recent instances of OE-NEA collaboration are also cited.

The Endowment's major commitment to school and youth programming, however, is identified in the paper as that beginning in about 1971 in which each of the agency's twelve major programs began channeling funds to artists and organizations serving the schools, "with the massive ($ million in FY 1976) Artists-in-Schools Program as the centerpiece."

The paper concludes this section by stating that "on the basis of budget projections for the agency and its original legislative mandate," it appears unlikely that the Endowment will, in the future, allocate funds to support such aspects of formal schooling as curriculum development or teacher training. Rather, it sees the Endowment's role in these matters as more appropriately one of "advocacy" in which staff members will continue "to devote considerable organizational energy to stimulate support from other sources."

The paper points out that the National Council on the Arts, which sets basic Endowment policy, recently reaffirmed its historic position on this issue along the lines indicated above, in a policy statement adopted at the Council's November, 1976, meeting.

In its recommendations concerned with school and youth programming, the paper addresses such concerns as:

1) strengthening the agency's communications with the field, including the professional arts education associations and the other Federal and state agencies concerned with the arts and education;

2) disseminating informational materials "which address various aspects of arts in education to help people formulating programs as well as to help improve existing programs";

3) advocacy and comprehensive approaches with respect to interagency cooperation, encouraging NIE to support new arts research studies, clarifying the Endowment's educational role vis-a-vis the other agencies, and encouraging "new enthusiasm and financial support from the Congress for artists and cultural institutions in educational settings through the appropriate Federal agencies.

An Appendix to the paper provides statistical data on the Endowment's educational grant making for the fiscal years 1971 and 1975, giving dollar figures and number of grants in breakdowns across a number of educational categories. More detailed information on nine major Endowment programs involved in educational programming is also provided.

Comparative Summary and Conclusions

The Introduction to this survey pointed to the fact that the nine documents under consideration here had been selected largely for reasons of representativeness, topicality, significance, and their usefulness for comprehensive policy formulation at all operational levels. It also mentioned that they were only the tip of a veritable mountain of such published and unpublished materials produced in recent years. A few such documents of recent vintage (but, again, by no means all) are listed in the Appendix, including a whole series of recent GPO publications concerned with career education in the arts and the humanities. It was only the necessity for keeping this descriptive survey from becoming excessively long in itself that prevented some of these publications from being covered.

The very disparateness of those which have been included complicates the attempt at a comparative analysis aimed at identifying common themes and concerns. Their purposes, indeed, are as varied as their styles and approaches. Several, for instance, don't really set forth "recommendations," as such -- notably Try a New Face, Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter, and Arts in Education Partners. Of these, the first is basically a description of some exemplary programs, the second is a retrospective look at earlier research activity, and the last is an avowedly how-to-do-it handbook for effective school-community cooperation. Another (The Arts Endowment and Education) makes recommendations but is, as noted, an in-house agency document which was not intended for broad circulation.

Some pointing up of common threads can, however, be made. And it is also possible to identify some issues which have either been treated in cursory fashion or have not been treated at all.

Federal Support

In the matter of common threads, the first issue that stands out with great clarity is that all but one of these documents calls for -- in some fashion or another -- an enlargement of Federal support for arts education. Whether this plea -- nay, often, this demand -- is aimed at expanding the authorization and appropriation levels of existing Federal programs in this field, or points to the necessity for developing new, more comprehensive and coordinated legislation that responds specifically to unmet needs in arts education, the urgency of the call is unmistakable.

Some of these documents speak to such needs in an across-the-board manner; indeed Coming to Our Senses, by stressing the centrality of the arts to all learning, seems to aspire to nothing less than reforming the entire fabric of education. Its recommendations are so all-encompassing that they even urge the creation of a cabinet-level "Department of Education" as well as new Federal initiatives aimed at developing "a ten-year strategy for the arts in education." Not all of this report's 98 specific recommendations seem susceptible to Federal intervention, yet many of them appear -- if only indirectly -- to be either arguments for it or to require Federal initiatives as the centerpiece of their implementation.

Others among the documents decry the lack of current Federal programs to support specific continuing needs in this field -- notably those affecting educational R & D in arts education. It may no longer be required, as the Murphy-Jones report points out was the case in the earlier "Federal chapter" in arts education research, to have the Developmental tail wagging the Research dog in any future Federal program. But a number of these publications make it crystal clear that the urgent but unfunded research tasks which should undergird this entire field will never be undertaken without a new Federal-level program to support them.

Clearly, not all the issues in arts education that require attention from the Federal level are identified in these papers -- or, if they are, the treatment is insubstantial. The matter of advanced professional training for artists in higher education institutions is hardly mentioned -- nor indeed is that of strengthening the arts and arts education faculties in liberal arts institutions so that the aesthetic interests and development of the non-arts student are not neglected entirely.

But, even though these issues come through insubstantially (if at all) in the surveyed documents, the demand for Federal attention to the field as a whole is articulated with growing insistence in virtually all of them. And although this message may appear, here and there, to be calling for new categorical programs (i.e., in research), a closer reading will reveal that the plea in general is for more comprehensive programs and for more coordinated policy planning in their legislative development.

The Case For Planning

One of the other major themes running through these documents is the essential place of planning -- particularly with respect to local programs. And here again, the lessons of the past (identified especially in the AAE Position Paper, but noted in others as well) contribute to a general consensus that sound and successful programs are invariably the result of systematic advance planning which includes all those who will ultimately be involved in their implementation.

In one important aspect of arts programming in the schools (that involving the support and cooperation of community arts resources) one publication explores the role and function of such coordinated planning in considerable depth -- the JDR 3rd Fund's handbook, Arts in Education Partners. But the absolute necessity of the planning component is emphasized in most of the other documents which, in any way, concern themselves with exemplary programs, from Coming to Our Senses to Try A New Face and the Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education.

It is a lesson that local practitioners embarking on new programs around the country, in the days and years to come, will ignore at their peril. And it is a lesson, moreover, that ought not to be lost on state and Federal arts and education authorities as well, either in the manner in which they set about the development of their own programs or in the guidelines and regulations which they prescribe for locally targeted programs.

Professional Artists as Teachers

Still another rather pervasive element running throughout these documents has to do with the increasing involvement of professional artists at the pre-collegiate levels of education. Although this issue is the central concern of only one document (the Endowment's Position Paper), it does weave in and out of all the others rather more pointedly than would have been the case ten, or even five, years ago.

Other than taking positions of a generally supportive nature with respect to this increasing artist involvement, however, these particular publications seem more than a little uncertain about precisely what the role and function of the "artist as teacher" should be. None of them really grapples with this question in any depth nor tackles the prickly matter it foreshadows: namely, the uneasiness (and often the outright resistance) with which this growing practice is frequently being met by professional arts educators -- some of whom, incidentally, are professional artists themselves and continue to function as such outside the classroom whenever possible.

Although it may seem reasonable and proper to some in education, for instance, that "teacher certification standards be waived for all artists . . . participating in academic programs" (as Coming To Our Senses advocates), others may feel with equal rationality that this is not necessarily an open-and-shut case when -- for one thing -- it is plain that not all artists are likely to be effective teachers.

What would seem to be needed in this area of arts education is, on the one hand, the sort of full-dress, handbook treatment with which the JDR 3rd Fund's Arts in Education Partners approaches the more programmatic and institutional nature of school-community cooperation in the arts -- a kind of how-to-do-it examination of the situation for both artists and teachers (and for school administrators, as well). At the same time, there is also a need for a second kind of document: one that would forthrightly come to grips with some of the pricklier issues that loom ahead for these two groups of professionals in their work together. Such a document could perhaps be the product of a joint task force that included representatives from the professional associations and representatives of those professional artists who have been working in schools or other educational settings. This group might study and make recommendations about the whole range of professional -- and interpersonal -- relationships which both unite and divide them in their work with young people, including such matters as certification, classroom role and function, learning beyond the schoolhouse walls, and professional standards and qualifications.

As of now, neither of these groups has anything very specific to guide them in their working relationships with one another (or with students themselves) except the rhetoric coming from both camps, a few sets of governmental program guidelines, and the experience of those who have begun to do it, for better or worse. The importance and the promise of this partnership effort demands, at least, that more flexible and prag-

matic guidelines be developed -- and to be useful, they need not be set in concrete either.

Agendas For Policy Development

In terms of placing on the table a list of "agenda items" for consideration by Federal policymakers, only three of these documents appear to have directed their recommendations toward this end -- Coming to Our Senses, CEMREL's Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future, and the AAE Position Paper "Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support of Arts Education."

Of these, it is perhaps the AAE Position Paper which has attempted most directly to concentrate its concerns on "major continuing needs" that could form a minimum list of agenda items for Federal-level consideration. The CEMREL publication, of course, spells out in much greater detail those research-related issues which are merely highlighted briefly in the AAE document: basic and applied research, and those specific subcategories of applied research that relate to curriculum development, evaluation, testing and measurement, and the dissemination and diffusion of materials resulting from various field studies and investigations. And many of the recommendations in Coming to Our Senses bulwark items listed in the AAE Position Paper's agenda, and add others of a strategy nature to it as well.

In addition to the research and development needs listed in that paper, there is, of course, the identification of Professional and staff development needs -- the other major area within arts education which is par-

ticularly susceptible to Federal initiatives. Subsumed under this heading are: in-service and pre-service education of teachers (generalists and specialists alike) and other leadership development needs in this field across a wide range of professions that relate to it -- including specifically that of the professional artist who intends to work in classrooms or with students outside the classroom. (Again, Coming to Our Senses elaborates on the range of leadership development needs, especially those relating to state and local arts councils, state education agencies, school administrators, and community-based arts institutions).

From these three documents in particular, then, it appears that Federal policymakers could begin to sense pretty clearly what is most urgently on the minds of arts education leaders. In their own deliberations, these policymakers, program planners, and legislation-writers must finally decide what specific issues can and should be shaped into a new legislative program that is responsive to the unmet needs in this field.

As noted earlier, what has been largely omitted from the publications, or treated only superficially, is the whole matter of arts education needs at the higher education level. These needs would embrace, in part at least, those aspects of teacher education or retraining which can or should be the responsibility of colleges and universities, conservatories, or institutes; the matter of developing an adequate and effective corps of teachers of teachers; the problem of strengthening the arts education faculties of liberal arts institutions and of the fine and performing arts faculties of those schools of the arts which are

concerned rather exclusively with the training of future artists. These are essentially the "missing constituencies" in the group of publications under review here, and it is something of a moot point whether or not these postsecondary needs and concerns should be considered, on the Federal level, together with those of a pre-collegiate nature or should emerge in an entirely separate agenda.

The Need for Additional Single-Discipline Studies

The absence from this survey of other studies, similar to that of the Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education, points up the need for equally systematic explorations of the field of music, dance, and theatre education by their respective professional associations.

The Music Educators National Conference has not undertaken such a study since the impressive report of The Tanglewood Symposium, "Music in American Society," published in 1968. That publication, according to MENC leaders, is still the most definitive statement of MENC's position and concerns in music education -- and they admit that it is now somewhat outdated. The March 1977 issue of the Music Educators Journal, which is entirely devoted to the question of career education in music, has taken up part of the slack, and the four-page brochure published in 1970 by MENC and entitled "Goals and Objectives for Music Education" fills another gap. But there is still a need for a document as comprehensive and rigorous in its scrutiny of this field as the NAEA Report is on art education.

Although neither dance or theatre education are as firmly or as long established in the schools as their sister art forms, there is an even more pressing need for something similar in their professional fields. And there is now word that such a study on dance education will be published in October of this year by the National Dance Association (an affiliate Association of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation -- AAHPER).

That forthcoming publication is entitled Dance as Education and is the result of a 1976 conference, held at the Kennedy Center and sponsored by an AAE grant, which was focused on "Issues and Concerns in Dance Education." The conference was concerned with "creating, guiding, evaluating and defending dance experiences in the schools" and the resulting report is described as "a strong, reasoned and comprehensive view of the issues and concerns in dance education." It is said to deal with what "Dance Is. . . ," the curriculum issues in dance education, and the qualifications and preparation of teachers and specialists in dance -- including non-certified teachers, the dancer, the physical educator, the arts teacher, and the classroom teacher. It should be a most welcome addition to the literature in arts education.

It now remains for the American Theatre Association to concern itself with an overall study of a similar kind. Although many special-purpose publications have been issued by that association in past years (i.e., the 1973 publication, "Secondary School Theatre"), a current and full-dress exploration of theatre education has yet to be undertaken.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. List of Publications Surveyed and Ordering Information

Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education, report of The Panel on Arts, Education, and Americans, a special projects panel of the American Council for the Arts in Education, McGraw-Hill, 1977. Available from McGraw-Hill Book Company, Book Distribution Center, Princeton Road, Hightstown, New Jersey 08520. Price: $5.95.

The Education of Adolescents: The Final Report and Recommendations of the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976. Available from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Publication No. OE-76-00004; Price: $2.15.

"Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support of Arts Education," by Junius Eddy. A position paper of the Alliance for Art Education, Summer 1977. Limited number of copies available from Alliance for Arts Education, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C. 20566.

Report of the NAEA Commission on Art Education, National Art Education Association, 1977. Available from NAEA, 1916 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091.

Arts in Education Partners: Schools and Their Communities, Nancy Shuker, editor. Jointly sponsored by the Junior League of Oklahoma City, the Arts Council of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma City Public Schools, the Association of Junior Leagues, and the JDR 3rd Fund, 1977. Available from ACA Publications, 570 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10018. Price: $6.00.

Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future, Stanley S. Madeja, editor. CEMREL, Inc. 1977. Available from Director of Publications, CEMREL, 3120 59th Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63139. Price: $12.00

Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter, by Judith Murphy and Lonna Jones. Office of Education U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977. Available about February 1978 from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Publication No. (OE) 76-02000; price to be announced.

Try a New Face, Music Educators National Conference in cooperation with the American Theatre Association, the National Art Education Association, and the National Dance Association. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978. Available in

1978 from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Publication No. and price to be announced.

"The Arts Endowment and Education," unpublished policy paper of the National Endowment for the Arts, April 7, 1977, A.B. Spellman, editor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

2. Other Recent Reports Dealing with Arts Education

A Study of the Poetry and Visual Arts Components of the Artists-in-Schools Program: 1) Study Summary and 2) Technical Report. Western States Arts Foundation, 1976. Available from all state arts agencies or from the Western States Arts Foundation, 1517 Market Street, Denver, Colorado 80202.

Arts Education Advocacy, National Art Education Association in cooperation with the Music Educators National Conference, the American Theatre Association, and the National Dance Association, 1976. Available from NAEA, 1916 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091.

Dance as Education, by Charles B. Fowler. National Dance Association, 1977. Available from the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Price: $4.95.

The Art Museum as Educator, a study by the Council on Museums and Education in the Visual Arts. Available February 1978 from the University of California Press, 2223 Fulton Street, Berkeley, California 94720. Price: $14.95, paperback; $30.00, hardback.

Through the Arts to the Aesthetic: The CEMREL Aesthetic Education Curriculum, by Stanley S. Madeja and Sheila Onuska. CEMREL, Inc., 1977. Available from Director of Publications, CEMREL, 3120 59th Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63139. Price: $5.75.

Career Exploration Series: All publications listed below are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Order by title and stock number.

Career Guidance in the Arts and Humanities: Activities, Information, and Resources for Grades 7-12. December 1976. 196 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01644-3. $2.60.

Exploring Arts and Humanities Careers in the Community: A Program Planning Guide. December, 1976. 68 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01648-6. $1.25.

391 Ways to Explore Arts and Humanities Careers: Classroom Activities in Dance, Music, Theater and Media, Visual Arts and Crafts, Writing, Humanities. December, 1976. 176 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01643-5. $2.40

Exploring Dance Careers: A Student Guidebook. 32 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01638-9. $.75

Exploring Music Careers: A Student Guidebook. 72 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01639-7. $1.30

Exploring Theater and Media Careers: A Student Guidebook. 144 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01640-1. $2.15

Exploring Visual Arts and Crafts Careers: A Student Guidebook. 168 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01641-9. $2.35

Exploring Writing Careers: A Student Guidebook. 80 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01642-7. $1.40

Exploring Careers in the Humanities: A Student Guidebook. 180 pages. Stock No. 017-080-01640-4. $2.45

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1978 O-734-102/532